

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/961,363	09/25/2001	Takenori Idehara	011350-287	5946	
75	590 08/11/2006		EXAM	INER	
Platon N. Mandros			REFAI, RAMSEY		
BURNS, DOAI P.O. Box 1404	NE, SWECKER & MA	THIS, L.L.P.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, V	A 22313-1404		2152 DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7 A - NA	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/961,363	IDEHARA ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramsey Refai	2152	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 July 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods:</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi</li> </ul>		e final rejection, whicheve	er is later. In no
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a since an incomposition.</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal of	of the appeal.
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NC bw); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	t (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		<b>-</b>	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	illowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendn	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 46-71. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ worlded below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			ance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO 1449) Paper WILLIAM VAUGHN RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER	No(s) Ramsey Refai AU 2152	<i>'</i>

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100** 

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance that:

A) the Final Rejection is premature and should be withdrawn since the new grounds of rejection were neither necessitated by amendment nor based on information submitted in an IDS

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. MPEP 1207.04 entitled "REOPENING OF PROSECUTION AFTER APPEAL" states "The examiner may, with approval from the supervisory patent examiner, reopen prosecution to enter a new ground of rejection after appellant's brief or reply brief has been filed. The Office action containing a new ground of rejection may be made final if the new ground of rejection was (A) necessitated by amendment, or (B) based on information presented in an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) where no statement under 37 CFR 1.97(e) was filed." The Final rejection was necessitated by Amendment filed March 3, 2006, which contained several amendments to the claims changing the scope of the pending claims. Therefore the Final rejection was not premature.

B) nothing in Wallis et al teach or suggests a system including a data transmission device and a data receiving device which are connected to a network and at least one portable terminal; rather all devices are connected to the network.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation, Wallis et al does teach a system including a data transmission device and a data receiving device which are connected to a network and at least one portable terminal as claimed. Wallis et al teach a data transmission device (client computer transmits data to server) that requires the address of a data-receiving device (server). The data transmission device requests the address of the data-receiving device from a data processing system (portable terminal). The data processing system can then poll the servers and obtain the address of the server and forward the address to the data transmission device. The address is then used to connect to the data-receiving device and allow for data to transfer to the data-receiving device. Nothing in the claims states that the portable terminal is not connected to the network.

## C) devices in Wallis et al are not portable

Although the term portable is used in the claims (portable terminal), no further limitations in the claims teach any portability characteristic of the terminal. If the portable terminal is indeed a portable device such as a wireless phone, pda, memory card, etc, the claim language should clearly distinguish the relevance and importance of this portability feature..